DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
Headquarters Space Systems Division (AFSC)
Los Angeles Air Force Base CA 90009-2960

SSDR 800-7 Regulation 800-7
31 May 1990

Acquisition Management

AEROSPACE CORPORATION PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS

This regulation establishes responsibilities and-provides guidance for the preparation of semi-annual Aerospace Performance Evaluation Reports. The provisions of this regulation apply to all contracts dated 13 December 1989 **and** later. This regulation specifies procedures to be used to evaluate Aerospace support to your programs and projects. Your periodic evaluations will allow Aerospace management to identify areas needing improvement and areas performing above standard. The evaluations will support the Space Systems Division Total Quality Management program by identifying continuous improvement opportunities. This regulation applies to HQ Space Systems Division(SSD) and all other organizations receiving support from The Aerospace Corporation through the SSD/Aerospace Contract. This regulation covers both individual program/project evaluations and consolidated reports summarizing overall Aerospace performance on the contract.

1. Areas for Evaluation, The Aerospace Corporation (Aerospace), through a Space Systems Division research and development contract, provides scientific and engineering support on specifically identified programs. In general, Aerospace supports efforts directed at developing and improving: Mission performance of space systems, plans and systems architectures, foreign technology assessments, selected research, development, test and evaluation (SRDT&E) projects, mission oriented investigation and experimentation (MOIE) **projects, multi program systems enhancements, acquisition** support, and engineering methods.

2, Responsibilities:

a. The Director of Systems Engineering (SSD/SDE). Will call for Aerospace supported organizations to prepare Program and Project Evaluation reports (AFSC Form 1641s),

Supersedes SSDR800-7, **10 Ott** 86. (See signature page for summary of changes.)
No. of Printed Pages: 5
OPR: SSD/SDEA (LtCol Beaird)
Approved by: Col W.S. Weisinger
Writer/editor: Mr J. Ray
Distribution: F; X
HQAFSC/SSD 1

during March and September of each year. SSD/SDE will consolidate all submitted evaluations into semiannual Technical Objective and Plans (TO&Ps) level summary reports. A copy of the summary report will be given to SSD/CC, SSD/PKR, and the president of Aerospace (through SSD/PKR) by 30 April and 31 October for action at the TO&P level. The semi-annual summary reports will give appropriate consideration to the size of the Aerospace effort (number of members of the technical staff (MTS) work units) covered by each individual <evaluation and to the significance of the effort in relation to national security in the context of the SSD mission.

b. SSD System Program Office Directors, Staff Directors, Program Managers, and Project Officers Who who are receiving Aerospace technical support, are responsible for the preparation of semi-annual evaluations of Aerospace Corporation performance by Job Order Number (JON). An AFSC Form 1641, Aerospace Corporation Performance Evaluation Report, will be prepared for each JON. If a program or project is supported by more than one JON, a summary, program or project level, AFSC Form 1641 will also be prepared. The complete evaluation **package** (both JON level AFSC form 1641s and

program or project level AFSC form 1641s) will be submitted to the Special Two-Letter Office (defined below) for review and additional comments. There will be one evaluation for each Aerospace JON, Each evaluation shall be independent, that is, the same JON shall not be in more than one JON level evaluation. Evaluations shall not be made of individual JON suborders (dash numbers).

c. SSD Assist Chiefs of Staff, Two Letter SSD Program and Staff Directors, the Commander, Air Force Space Technology Center, and test center commanders are hereafter referred to as Special Two Letter Offices (STLOs). STLOS will review reports received from their subordinates. STLOS may, to the extent necessary for clarification, add additional summary statements or background information for the report. STLOs will forward approved evaluation packages (both JON level AFSC forms 1641 and program or project level AFSC forms 1641) to SSD/SDE no later than 15 April *or* 15 October.

d. Aerospace Contract Management Office (SSD/PKR) is responsible for all Aerospace contract administration activities including assisting in the resolution of any below standard Aerospace performance evaluations.

3. GUIDANCE:

a. The Aerospace Corporation has been established to provide a highly technical, independent, objective organization to support Space Systems Division programs. The Aerospace Corporation is expected to ensure that the latest technical and scientific advances are applied to systems in a timely manner in order to provide the most cost effective space systems possible and that space system deficiencies are identified and corrected promptly. Aerospace also reviews space system contractor technical performance, and provides technical guidance and recommendations related to launch readiness. Therefore, each evaluation must consider the adequacy of Aerospace services provided to your programs in fulfillment of the responsibilities delegated to the Aerospace Corporation by your Technical Objectives and Plans (TO&Ps) (ref SSDR 800-8).

b. Your evaluation ***must*** also consider the quality of work performed by Aerospace MTS without singling out named individuals for outstanding or poor performance. A letter to Aerospace management, recognizing an individual's work, is more effective and timely.

c. Finally, Aerospace should not be rated on problems which are beyond its control such as the level of MTS authorized for a specific task, shifts in MTS support because of changes in SSD priorities, or its inability to perform tasks not authorized by SSDR 800-8.

OFFICIAL

DONALD L. CROMER, Lt Gen, USAF
Commander

WILLIAM A. DENTON, Maj, USAF
Director of Information Management

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

Paragraph 1 has been added to explain the function of Aerospace and the purpose of evaluations. The responsibilities section has been updated to reflect current office symbols and the shift of some responsibilities from SSD/PKR (formerly PMR) to SSD/SDE. Additionally, this section has been clarified to specify uniform evaluation levels. The guidance section has been reworded for clarity and shortened. The form prescribed section has been deleted as it is not needed. Attachment 1, instructions for completion of the aerospace corporation performance evaluation report (AFSC Form 1641) have been expanded to include specific evaluation standards for each AFSC Form 1641 evaluation item.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF THE AEROSPACE CORPORATION PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT (AFSC Form 1641)

PART I

1. Effectiveness of Aerospace Management Approach: The Aerospace management level to be evaluated should be the Aerospace counterpart of the Air Force evaluator. Includes the evaluation of Aerospace management in providing: A cost effective and efficient organization; the necessary mix of technical expertise; the leadership and guidance given to their staff.

a. Above Standard - Management approach and leadership consistently provide a responsive organization, minimize personnel turnover problems (within Aerospace's purview), and maintain all necessary technical skills to support specific TO&P tasking.

b. Meets Standard - Management approach and leadership usually provide a responsive organization, accommodate personnel turnover (within Aerospace's purview), and maintain adequate technical skills to satisfy specific TO&P tasking.

c. Below Standard - Management approach and leadership fail to provide a responsive organization, or accommodate personnel turnover (within Aerospace's purview), or fails to maintain adequate technical skills to satisfy specific TO&P tasking.

2. Problem Solving Ability: Includes the demonstrated ability of Aerospace personnel to develop solutions to problems that: Draw upon expertise in all relevant skills; incorporate the latest state of the art; keep within established cost and schedule limits.

a. Above Standard - Problem solving ability is demonstrated by an innovative systems approach which considers all aspects of a problem. Proposed solutions consistently minimize program cost and schedule impacts.

b. Meets Standard - Problem solving usually considers all aspects of a problem. Proposed solutions normally minimize program cost and schedule impacts.

c. Below Standard - Problem solving fails to consider one or more critical aspects of problems. Proposed solutions fail to minimize program cost and schedule impacts.

3. Responsiveness to Program Needs: Includes Aerospace response to program requirements with special emphasis on timeliness and quality.

a. Above Standard - Consistently anticipates and responds to program needs and recognizes potential problems. Program requirements are systematically addressed and all suspenses are met.

b. Meets Standard - Anticipates program requirements which are then systematically addressed. Suspenses are normally met.

c. Below Standard - Program requirements are not anticipated and systematically addressed, or suspenses are late or incomplete.

4. Adequacy of Aerospace Support: includes evaluation of the appropriateness and effectiveness of all members of the technical staff (MTS) assigned to a program or project which is the responsibility of the Air Force.

a. Above Standard - Aerospace MTS skills assigned to a program or project are consistently appropriate for the project. Additionally the individual effectiveness level of MTS assigned to a program is consistently appropriate. Together, the skill mix and effectiveness level of Aerospace MTS support your program in an efficient and effective manner.

b. Meets Standard MTS skills and effectiveness levels selected to support a program are normally appropriate, MTS skill mix and effectiveness levels adequately support programs.

c. Below Standard - MTS skill mix or effectiveness levels are inadequate to support programs. Program support is inefficient or inadequate.

5. Technical Competence and Objectivity: Includes the evaluation of technical, scientific, and engineering abilities of Aerospace MTS.

a. Above Standard - Aerospace consistently demonstrates credible and highly objective technical abilities relative to planning factors, technical recommendations, and problem solutions.

b. Meets Standard - Aerospace normally demonstrates credible and objective technical abilities relative to planning factors, technical recommendations and problem solutions.

c. Below Standard - Aerospace fails to demonstrate credible or objective technical abilities relative to planning factors, technical recommendations, or problem solutions.

6. Initiative and Cooperation of Supporting Team: Consider the performance of the entire Aerospace Corporation team assigned to a specific program or project as specified by your TO&P.

a. Above Standard - Aerospace consistently displays high standards of initiative and cooperation. Problem areas are identified well in advance of program impacts. Aerospace support team enthusiasm always contributes to success.

b. Meets Standard - Aerospace usually demonstrates positive cooperation, initiative, and enthusiasm.

c. Below Standard - Aerospace fails to demonstrate positive cooperation or initiative. Program success has not been enhanced by support team enthusiasm.

7. System Program Office (SPO)/Aerospace Working Relations:

a. Management Level - This includes the evaluation of the Aerospace counterpart of the evaluator.

(1) Above Standard - Management level working relations are consistently professional and business-like. Working relations contribute positively to program success. Communication is good.

(2) Meets Standard - Management level working relations normally contribute to program success.

(3) Below Standard - Management level working relationships are often characterized by lack of communication and often do not contribute to program success.

b. Working level - Includes the ability of Aerospace employees to work with their Air Force (and Industry) counterparts to develop a rapport resulting in mutually agreeable methods of attaining mission objectives in a team relationship.

(1) Above Standard - Working level rapport consistently promotes open communications and program success.

(2) Meets Standard - Working level rapport normally contributes to program success.

(3) Below Standard - Working level rapport is often characterized by failures to communicate and does not contribute positively to program success.

8. Work Force Capability:

a. Key people - Includes evaluation of the productivity, leadership, and initiative provided by those Key Aerospace MTS who interface directly with the SPO.

(1) Above Standard - Key Aerospace members consistently display superior productivity, 'leadership, and initiative. Leadership consistently contributes to program success.

(2) Meets Standard - Key Aerospace members are normally productive and display effective leadership and initiative, Leadership contributes to program success,

(3) Below Standard - Key Aerospace members fail to provide constructive leadership and initiative. Leadership does not contribute to program success.

b. Supporting MTS - Includes evaluation of those matrix MTS tasked by the Aerospace Program Office to provide specific engineering and scientific support.

(1) Above Standard - Supporting Aerospace members consistently display superior productivity, leadership, and initiative. Leadership consistently contributes to program

success,

(2) Meets Standard - Supporting Aerospace members normally display adequate productivity and constructive leadership and initiative. Leadership normally contributes to program success.

(3) Below Standard - Supporting Aerospace members are nonproductive or fail to provide constructive leadership and initiative. Leadership does not contribute to program success,

9. Visibility of Aerospace Support - Evaluate the degree of visibility The Aerospace Corporation provides to you of current and planned Aerospace activities for each program or project. Consider the adequacy of information provided by Aerospace.

a. Above Standard - Formal reports prepared per SSDR 800-8 and your TO&P tasking along with informa1 reports consistently provide timely and accurate program status information. Program schedules and plans are updated and current.

b. Meets Standard - Formal reports prepared per SSDR 800-8 and your TO&P provide timely and accurate program status information,

c. Below Standard - Aerospace reports and status briefings are insufficient to track program progress,

10. Technical Accomplishments - Evaluate the results realized through technical inputs from Aerospace for your program or project.

a. Above Standard.- Aerospace technical accomplishments and inputs consistently make major contribuions to program success.

b. Meets Standard - Aerospace technical accomplishments and inputs normally contribute positively to program success.

c. Below Standard - Aerospace technical accomplishments and inputs fail to contribute to program success.

11. Overall Quality of Aerospace Effort - Your evaluation for this area should consider all the salient aspects of Aerospace support including subjects which may not have been included above. Consider the overall effect of Aerospace performance onyour program.

a. Above "Standard - Overall, Aerospace performance has consistently and positively contributed to program success.

b. Meets Standard - Overall, Aerospace performance has normally contributed to program success.

c. Below Standard - Overall, Aerospace performance has not significantly contribute to program success.

PART II

1. Significant Management Problems/-Suggestions will be described with a proposed plan for solution. These issues do not have to be related to the Evaluation in PART I.

a. Comments shall be provided for all Above Standard and Below Standard ratings. The comments may be a summary, not necessarily keyed to each scoring criteria of PART 1. The appropriate Aerospace counterpart should be notified before a Below Standard rating is assigned and joint Space Systems Division/-Aerospace efforts, should be made in sufficient time to allow the resolution of such a rating. The Aerospace Contract Management Office, SSD/PKR, will assist in obtaining a satisfactory solution after being informed of a problem indicating a Below Standard performance rating.

b. The appropriate Aerospace counterpart shall be notified of problems included in this report and joint Space Systems Division/Aerospace efforts shall be made to solve the problems. All problems reported should include a brief description of the actions taken and the current status of problems.

c. Regularly scheduled reviews with Aerospace management counterparts conducted per SSDR 800-8 should be used to mutually discuss issues and resolve problems. .